

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1 – 18 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6, 9-11, 13-15, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,426,798 (Yeung) in view of US publication number 2005/0179921 (Brossman) and US publication number 2003/0126219 (Tanimoto). These rejections are traversed.

The independent claims recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in Yeung in view of Brossman and Tanimoto. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art. Some examples are provided below for independent claim 1.

As one example, independent claim 1 recites identifying markup language code embedded in the printing device associated with the configuration attributes supported by the printing device and markup language code embedded in the printing device unsupported by the printing device. Yeung in view of Brossman and Tanimoto does not identify both markup language code associated with the configuration attributes supported by the printing device and markup language code embedded in the printing device unsupported by the printing device.

In Yeung, an EEPROM stores printer-related information that can be provided to the print driver to inform the computing equipment of parameters of the printer (see Yeung at column 5, lines 47-51). Nowhere does Yeung teach or even suggest that the printer identifies both markup language code associated with the configuration attributes “supported” by the printing device and markup language code embedded in the printing device “unsupported” by the printing device. Brossman is generally directed to device independent print job ticketing and fails to cure the deficiencies of Yeung. Tanimoto is generally directed to transmitting formed device setting form-data as an email and fails to cure the deficiencies of Yeung.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As another example, claim 1 recites transmitting the markup language code that is associated with the configuration attributes supported by the printing device and excluding the markup language code that is unsupported by the printing device. Yeung in view of Brossman and Tanimoto does not transmit markup language code supported by the printing device and also exclude markup language code unsupported by the printing device.

In Yeung, an EEPROM stores printer-related information that can be provided to the print driver to inform the computing equipment of parameters of the printer (see Yeung at column 5, lines 47-51). Nowhere does Yeung teach or even suggest transmitting markup language code supported by the printing device and also excluding markup language code unsupported by the printing device. Brossman is generally directed to device independent print job ticketing and fails to cure the deficiencies of Yeung. Tanimoto is generally directed to transmitting formed device setting form-data as an email and fails to cure the deficiencies of Yeung.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,426,798 (Yeung) in view of US publication number 2005/0179921 (Brossman), US publication number 2003/0126219 (Tanimoto), USPN 6,820,067 (Hammond), and US publication number 2003/0048470 (Garcia). Claims 7, 8, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,426,798 (Yeung) in view of US publication number 2005/0179921 (Brossman), US publication number 2003/0126219 (Tanimoto), and US publication number 2003/0048470 (Garcia). These rejections are traversed.

As explained herein, Yeung in view of Brossman and Tanimoto fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the independent claims. Hammond and Garcia fail to cure these deficiencies. Thus, dependent claims 5, 7, 8, 12, and 17 are allowable for at least the reasons provided for their respective independent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529